

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
BLUEFIELD

LATHRONEA P. GRESHAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NOS. 1:92-01003
1:92-01004

TRANSPORATION COMMUNICATIONS
INTERNATIONAL UNION, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER


By Orders entered on July 28, 2015, and November 6, 2015, the court denied plaintiff's motion(s) to reopen the above-captioned cases which had been closed more than twenty years. Gresham appealed the court's order entered in Civil Action No. 1:92-01003 and, on December 2, 2015, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit dismissed her appeal for failure to prosecute. Thereafter, on March 21, 2016, Gresham filed a rather voluminous paper with the court which she entitled "Plaintiffs' Amendments As of Course Along With Notarized Summary And Final Notice of Fraud Upon the Court by Officers." (Doc. No. 187 in Civil Action 1:92-01003).

As this court informed plaintiff in its earlier orders, these cases have long been closed and there is no reason to reopen them. For this reason, plaintiff is **PROHIBITED** from filing any further motions or papers in these cases unless such motions or papers are certified as non-frivolous by an attorney.

The court further **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court not to accept any further motions or papers filed by plaintiff in these actions unless they are so certified. **THIS ORDER DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT SHOULD PLAINTIFF WISH TO OBTAIN REVIEW OF THIS ORDER.** This Order does not place any limitation on plaintiff's ability to pursue litigation in any other case in this court or any other court, state or federal. Nor does this Order prohibit plaintiff from filing any new lawsuits that have a legitimate basis and comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(b) after payment of the appropriate filing fee. See Overton v. United States, No. 1:11-CV-00591, 2012 WL 2030313, *1 (S.D. Ohio June 6, 2012); see also Hollis-Arrington v. Fannie Mae, No. 04-5068, 2004 WL 2595891, *1 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 15, 2004) (holding that district court did not abuse its discretion in ruling that plaintiff may "file nothing further in relation to this case without leave of Court, other than a notice of appeal. . . .").

The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and to plaintiff, pro se. **IT IS SO ORDERED** this 12th day of April, 2016.

ENTER:



David A. Faber
Senior United States District Judge